

IN THE LOCAL FIELD.

WINDHAM COUNTY COURT.

FINE GAME AT BONDVILLE.

Headache Destroys Health

SAVE YOUR DOLLAR

Home Comfort Range of Honor.

You can do it with us this season, not one but many, according to the volume of your purchases. Don't travel all over the United States to buy a suit of clothes or a hat when you can do better right here

AT KNAPP'S

Than anywhere else Why freeze all winter when you can go to Knapp's and buy

A Warm, Comfortable Suit for Men, All Sizes, 35 to 44, For the Small Sum of \$4.50?

Better suits at \$7, \$8, \$10 and up. Ten dollars buys a good all wool worsted suit, undoubtedly equal to some you have bought of those high priced merchants for \$15. Why pay \$5 for a hat when \$3 at Knapp's buys a Guyer hat equal to any made. I have other grades at \$1.50, \$2 and \$2.50.

You can save your Shirts, Collars and Cuffs from being torn all to pieces in the laundry by leaving them at Knapp's when they will be done at the Knapp Laundry where the best work is guaranteed.

If you want Neckwear, Underwear, Gloves, Mittens, in fact anything that men wear, except boots and shoes, make a bee line for 87 Main street.

AMBROSE KNAPP, Brattleboro, Vt.

Prices of Coal for Present Delivery, Spot Cash.

Stove and Nut,	5.50
Egg,	5.25
Grate,	5.25
Lehigh,	5.75
Franklin,	8.50

This is not "Hot Coal," or "Stock Coal," but FRESHLY MIXED ALL RAIL.

C. H. BOND.

CARTER'S LITTLE LIVER PILLS.

CURE SICK HEADACHE

Headache, yet CARTER'S LITTLE LIVER PILLS are equally valuable in Constipation, curing and preventing this annoying complaint, which they also correct all disorders of the stomach, stimulate the liver and regulate the bowels. Even if they only cured

Ache they would be almost priceless to those who suffer from this distressing complaint; but fortunately their goodness does not end here, and their use is made more pleasant by the fact that they are so small and so easy to take.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Surely

You will come to the fair next week and when on the street don't miss our window display and as a special inducement for that week shall make reduced prices on all our goods.

Lace Curtains.

Did you notice in our window last week the handsome pair of lace curtains and the price only \$1.34 a pair, regular price \$2.

Cobbler or Leather Seat Rockers.

A full line from \$2.25 up. The finest rocker for \$3 ever seen. Have you seen our new designs in burlap?

RETING BROTHERS

F. & M. E.

The days are growing shorter and you are lighting your lamps earlier than you have been.

Now if the chimneys smoke up quicker than you think they ought to, and the wicks are crusted it is because the oil is none too good, and you want to use better.

We think we can suit you. We have have put in stock the best oil there is refined.

It will cost you but two cents per gallon more than the common, and that is nothing when you consider the satisfaction it gives.

F. & M. E.

E. W. HARLOW, Manager.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Three Gold Medals and one Silver Medal.

The World's Industrial and Cotton Centennial Exposition, New Orleans, 1884 and 1885.

Highest Awards

Nebraska State Board of Agriculture, 1887.

Highest Awards 25th Annual Fair

St. Louis Agricultural and Mechanical Association, 1889.

Six Highest Awards

World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893.

Six Gold Medals

California Midwinter Fair, San Francisco, Calif., 1903.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

Small Pill. Small Dose. Small Price.

HINDSDALE, N. H.

Mrs. M. A. Holland is in Athol, Mass., for an extended stay.

An Uncle Tom's Cabin company appears in the town hall next Tuesday evening.

Work has at last begun on the concrete walk to be laid on Main and High streets.

W. L. Merritt and family move next week to Amherst, Mass., where they will live.

Miss Iva Sargent left Tuesday for Rochester, N. Y., where she will spend the winter.

Mrs. Nelson Barrett is in Millers Falls, Mass., visiting her daughter, Mrs. Abbie G. Wilder.

The schools closed yesterday to allow the scholars to attend the Valley Fair. All the mills shut down also.

Rev. Mr. Holden of Glastonbury, Conn., will occupy the pulpit of the Congregational church next Sunday.

M. S. Leach had one of the best exhibits at the Valley Fair of wagons, carriages, harness, robes and blankets.

Chas. F. Mann is taking a bicycle trip through Vermont and New Hampshire. Mr. Innanah of Keene is taking his place in the Valley Record office.

Miss Little of Winchester is endeavoring to start a class in painting here, and will meet those interested at Mrs. Temple's, Canal street, this afternoon.

There will be a social assembly under good management at the town hall Thursday evening, Oct. 3, from 8 to 12. Leitinger's orchestra furnishes music for dancing.

Leslie Lazell was called to East Dover, Vt., last Friday by a shocking car accident, in which his grandmother was instantly killed and his father seriously injured.

Miss Annie Gray returned last week to the college of liberal arts, Boston University. She went via Plymouth, N. H., and attended the Nelson-Horner wedding.

The Hinsdale foot ball team was defeated at Athol, Mass., last Saturday by the Union Athletic team by a score of 12 to 0. They play the Leland and Gray academy team to-morrow on the home grounds.

E. A. Cadoret, for a long time a popular clerk in the drug department in the Windsor Co.'s store, has resigned his position and will return to his old home in Worcester, Mass., where he was at one time proprietor of an apothecary store.

The following delegates were chosen last Sunday by the Universalists to represent them at the state convention to be held at Woodsville Oct. 1 to 3. Church, Mrs. Esther Dickinson and Mrs. A. A. Blair; Sunday school, Miss Margaret Leonard and Wm. Jackson Leonard.

The Valley Record newspaper and job printing office was sold last week by Edward Stebbins, its proprietor, to C. H. Hopkins, who made the purchase for J. C. Holland of Derby Line, Vt. Mr. Holland was a bidder for the property when it was struck off at auction a short time ago to Lawyer Madden of Keene, but the purchase by the latter was not completed.

Mr. H. W. C. Bohrer, who attended Monday the marriage of another daughter, Minnie A. Bascom of this town, to William A. Kenney of Greenfield, Mass., Miss Bascom was one of our most widely known young ladies and Mr. Kenney is also well known, having formerly lived here. They were to remain, when they joined Mr. and Mrs. N. W. Worden of this town, with whom they will enjoy two weeks of camping and fishing in the wilds of Maine. Mr. and Mrs. Kenney will live in Greenfield, Mass., where Mr. Kenney holds the position of foreman of the Merriman & Tildens iron foundry.

Levi Streeter of North Hinsdale celebrated his 92nd birthday at the residence of his son, Isaiah C. Streeter, Thursday of last week. Mr. Streeter is Hinsdale's oldest citizen. He has always enjoyed excellent health and active from his youth as strong and vigorous as a man of 50. The past season he has chopped nearly 30 cords of wood, traveling a mile each way to his work, besides taking long tramps in the woods which younger men would hesitate to attempt.

Mrs. Streeter died several years since, but his large family of married sons and daughters were all present at the birthday party with scores of grandchildren. Supper was served on the lawn, and in the evening H. F. Horton and Rev. J. H. Knott of the Methodist church made speeches appropriate to the occasion, with response by Mr. Streeter's son in his father's behalf.

"A pleasant gathering took place at the home of Smith Rowe Wednesday morning on the occasion of the marriage of his granddaughter, Miss Blanche Caroline Horner to Herman Nelson. At 10 o'clock, to the music of the wedding march from Lohengrin, the bride couple, preceded by the bride's sister, Miss Vira, who was dressed in white with pink flowers, came down the stairway and stood under an evergreen arch in the parlor, where Rev. Noel E. Spicer of the Universalist church performed the ceremony. The bride was gowned in white organdie with valenciennes lace, and carried a large bouquet of bride roses. After the congratulations the bride and groom retired to the wedding breakfast; salads and ices were served. The bride's cake was served to the unmarried guests present. The bride's grandfather, a gentleman aged 81, danced at the wedding with the oldest lady present, 75 years of age. The presents were numerous and beautiful. The bride is a well-known young lady of Plymouth, and a graduate of the New Hampshire state normal school. The groom lives in West Pawlet, Vt., where he is a member of the firm of Rising & Nelson. The young couple started on an extended tour, after which they will go to their new home in West Pawlet." The above is from the Plymouth, N. H., correspondence in the Boston Herald. Miss Horner was for nearly four years a popular and efficient teacher in our high school.

NORTHFIELD, MASS.

Miss Alice Stebbins of Fitchburg recently visited Mrs. N. P. Wood.

The usual crowd attended the fair at Brattleboro, the public schools closing on Thursday.

Leland T. Powers, the popular impersonator, will be at Stone Hall Northfield Saturday evening.

M. L. Moore, tax collector, will be at the town hall on Tuesday, Oct. 1, to accommodate all who wish to pay their taxes.

Rev. Mr. Little of Winchester preached Sunday at the Unitarian church in exchange with the pastor, Rev. G. F. Piper.

The Skinner gymnasium is now completed, and dedicatory exercises were held at the building on Monday afternoon. Mr. Skinner of Holyoke, the giver, formally presented the building to the trustees, Mr. Moore of Boston, president of the trustees, replying. There followed short speeches by Mr. Otis of Yonkers, Mr. Reed of Springfield and others. Excellent music was furnished by the schools.

The case of the Vermont Farm Machine company vs. Francis Batcher & Co., which had been on trial since the morning of the second day of the term, was submitted to the jury at 10 a. m. Tuesday of this week. In the afternoon the jury returned a verdict for the defendant.

Bridget Kavanagh vs. Vermont Savings Bank. This was an action to recover about \$100, due on a certain deposit book issued by the bank on Jan. 6, 1892. The plaintiff's evidence tended to show that for many years she had been a servant in the family of Mrs. Bradley in Brattleboro. This prior to Jan. 6, 1892, when she was deposited in her own name in the defendant bank, so that at that time she had on deposit there moneys exceeding \$300. The plaintiff's evidence tended to show that the money deposited was all her own; that she retained said book in her possession, and that the money deposited was all her own; that the plaintiff had demanded payment to her of the amount due on said book, which defendant had declined to pay. The court held that as the book was issued in the name of Mary Kavanagh, and not to the plaintiff, Bridget; hence that the plaintiff could not recover in this action, and granted a verdict for the defendant, to which the plaintiff excepted.

Haskins & Stoddard for the plaintiff Waterman, Martin & Hitt for the defendant.

L. C. Powers vs. New England Fire Insurance Company. This was an action to recover for loss of dwelling house and household goods destroyed in a fire which occurred in Newfane in May, 1891, upon which a warrant company had issued a policy of insurance.

The evidence on the part of the plaintiff tended to show that the defendant company issued a policy of insurance to him Aug. 25, 1890, upon the dwelling house and household goods, for a term of three years, for \$500, and that the house and contents were destroyed by fire May 25, 1891, and that the property destroyed was worth a much larger sum of money than the amount of the insurance. The policy provided that in case of loss by fire notice should forthwith be given to the defendant, and that proofs of the loss, signed and sworn to by the assured, should be presented to the company within 30 days from date of fire. It also appeared on examination of the policy that the plaintiff had given notice and sent to the company within some 10 days after the fire, and that the company had received the same and his evidence tended to show that the reason why proofs were not furnished as provided in the conditions of the policy was that the defendant company, by its agents, wrote letters, in which they promised that the loss should be adjusted by them within 30 days, and that the matter was suffered to go along this way until after the 30 days had expired, and then the defendant company refused to pay anything further about it. The defendant, after plaintiff had rested his case, moved that the court direct a verdict for the plaintiff, on account of plaintiff's non-compliance with the conditions of the contract or policy of insurance; that the admission of evidence in regard to the waiver of any of the conditions of the policy, nor had any other representative of the company, except the present secretary, any power to waive any of its conditions, and that in case of waiver by the present secretary, such waiver should be entered in writing upon the policy.

The court decided to direct a verdict as requested by the defendant, and submitted the question to the jury after the opening argument for the plaintiff, the defendant's counsel declining to reply. Verdict for plaintiff to recover \$500.

Erin Waterman, Martin & Hitt for plaintiff, Butler for the defendant.

Mary Ritter Sherrill vs. Strook & L. Smith. This was an action of general assumpsit. The plaintiff claimed, and her evidence tended to show, that in October, 1894, she delivered to the defendant, Strook & L. Smith, a certain quantity of goods, to be sold for her, and that the defendant had received for the same a sum of money, and that the defendant had refused to pay to her the proceeds of the sale of the goods, and that the plaintiff had demanded payment to her of the amount due on said book, which defendant had declined to pay. The court held that as the book was issued in the name of Mary Kavanagh, and not to the plaintiff, Bridget; hence that the plaintiff could not recover in this action, and granted a verdict for the defendant, to which the plaintiff excepted.

The court decided to direct a verdict as requested by the defendant, and submitted the question to the jury after the opening argument for the plaintiff, the defendant's counsel declining to reply. Verdict for plaintiff to recover \$500.

Erin Waterman, Martin & Hitt for plaintiff, Butler for the defendant.

Mary Ritter Sherrill vs. Strook & L. Smith. This was an action of general assumpsit. The plaintiff claimed, and her evidence tended to show, that in October, 1894, she delivered to the defendant, Strook & L. Smith, a certain quantity of goods, to be sold for her, and that the defendant had received for the same a sum of money, and that the defendant had refused to pay to her the proceeds of the sale of the goods, and that the plaintiff had demanded payment to her of the amount due on said book, which defendant had declined to pay. The court held that as the book was issued in the name of Mary Kavanagh, and not to the plaintiff, Bridget; hence that the plaintiff could not recover in this action, and granted a verdict for the defendant, to which the plaintiff excepted.

The court decided to direct a verdict as requested by the defendant, and submitted the question to the jury after the opening argument for the plaintiff, the defendant's counsel declining to reply. Verdict for plaintiff to recover \$500.

Erin Waterman, Martin & Hitt for plaintiff, Butler for the defendant.

Mary Ritter Sherrill vs. Strook & L. Smith. This was an action of general assumpsit. The plaintiff claimed, and her evidence tended to show, that in October, 1894, she delivered to the defendant, Strook & L. Smith, a certain quantity of goods, to be sold for her, and that the defendant had received for the same a sum of money, and that the defendant had refused to pay to her the proceeds of the sale of the goods, and that the plaintiff had demanded payment to her of the amount due on said book, which defendant had declined to pay. The court held that as the book was issued in the name of Mary Kavanagh, and not to the plaintiff, Bridget; hence that the plaintiff could not recover in this action, and granted a verdict for the defendant, to which the plaintiff excepted.

The court decided to direct a verdict as requested by the defendant, and submitted the question to the jury after the opening argument for the plaintiff, the defendant's counsel declining to reply. Verdict for plaintiff to recover \$500.

Erin Waterman, Martin & Hitt for plaintiff, Butler for the defendant.

Mary Ritter Sherrill vs. Strook & L. Smith. This was an action of general assumpsit. The plaintiff claimed, and her evidence tended to show, that in October, 1894, she delivered to the defendant, Strook & L. Smith, a certain quantity of goods, to be sold for her, and that the defendant had received for the same a sum of money, and that the defendant had refused to pay to her the proceeds of the sale of the goods, and that the plaintiff had demanded payment to her of the amount due on said book, which defendant had declined to pay. The court held that as the book was issued in the name of Mary Kavanagh, and not to the plaintiff, Bridget; hence that the plaintiff could not recover in this action, and granted a verdict for the defendant, to which the plaintiff excepted.

The court decided to direct a verdict as requested by the defendant, and submitted the question to the jury after the opening argument for the plaintiff, the defendant's counsel declining to reply. Verdict for plaintiff to recover \$500.

Erin Waterman, Martin & Hitt for plaintiff, Butler for the defendant.

Mary Ritter Sherrill vs. Strook & L. Smith. This was an action of general assumpsit. The plaintiff claimed, and her evidence tended to show, that in October, 1894, she delivered to the defendant, Strook & L. Smith, a certain quantity of goods, to be sold for her, and that the defendant had received for the same a sum of money, and that the defendant had refused to pay to her the proceeds of the sale of the goods, and that the plaintiff had demanded payment to her of the amount due on said book, which defendant had declined to pay. The court held that as the book was issued in the name of Mary Kavanagh, and not to the plaintiff, Bridget; hence that the plaintiff could not recover in this action, and granted a verdict for the defendant, to which the plaintiff excepted.

The court decided to direct a verdict as requested by the defendant, and submitted the question to the jury after the opening argument for the plaintiff, the defendant's counsel declining to reply. Verdict for plaintiff to recover \$500.

Erin Waterman, Martin & Hitt for plaintiff, Butler for the defendant.

Mary Ritter Sherrill vs. Strook & L. Smith. This was an action of general assumpsit. The plaintiff claimed, and her evidence tended to show, that in October, 1894, she delivered to the defendant, Strook & L. Smith, a certain quantity of goods, to be sold for her, and that the defendant had received for the same a sum of money, and that the defendant had refused to pay to her the proceeds of the sale of the goods, and that the plaintiff had demanded payment to her of the amount due on said book, which defendant had declined to pay. The court held that as the book was issued in the name of Mary Kavanagh, and not to the plaintiff, Bridget; hence that the plaintiff could not recover in this action, and granted a verdict for the defendant, to which the plaintiff excepted.

The court decided to direct a verdict as requested by the defendant, and submitted the question to the jury after the opening argument for the plaintiff, the defendant's counsel declining to reply. Verdict for plaintiff to recover \$500.

Erin Waterman, Martin & Hitt for plaintiff, Butler for the defendant.

Mary Ritter Sherrill vs. Strook & L. Smith. This was an action of general assumpsit. The plaintiff claimed, and her evidence tended to show, that in October, 1894, she delivered to the defendant, Strook & L. Smith, a certain quantity of goods, to be sold for her, and that the defendant had received for the same a sum of money, and that the defendant had refused to pay to her the proceeds of the sale of the goods, and that the plaintiff had demanded payment to her of the amount due on said book, which defendant had declined to pay. The court held that as the book was issued in the name of Mary Kavanagh, and not to the plaintiff, Bridget; hence that the plaintiff could not recover in this action, and granted a verdict for the defendant, to which the plaintiff excepted.

The court decided to direct a verdict as requested by the defendant, and submitted the question to the jury after the opening argument for the plaintiff, the defendant's counsel declining to reply. Verdict for plaintiff to recover \$500.

Erin Waterman, Martin & Hitt for plaintiff, Butler for the defendant.

Mary Ritter Sherrill vs. Strook & L. Smith. This was an action of general assumpsit. The plaintiff claimed, and her evidence tended to show, that in October, 1894, she delivered to the defendant, Strook & L. Smith, a certain quantity of goods, to be sold for her, and that the defendant had received for the same a sum of money, and that the defendant had refused to pay to her the proceeds of the sale of the goods, and that the plaintiff had demanded payment to her of the amount due on said book, which defendant had declined to pay. The court held that as the book was issued in the name of Mary Kavanagh, and not to the plaintiff, Bridget; hence that the plaintiff could not recover in this action, and granted a verdict for the defendant, to which the plaintiff excepted.

The court decided to direct a verdict as requested by the defendant, and submitted the question to the jury after the opening argument for the plaintiff, the defendant's counsel declining to reply. Verdict for plaintiff to recover \$500.

Erin Waterman, Martin & Hitt for plaintiff, Butler for the defendant.

Mary Ritter Sherrill vs. Strook & L. Smith. This was an action of general assumpsit. The plaintiff claimed, and her evidence tended to show, that in October, 1894, she delivered to the defendant, Strook & L. Smith, a certain quantity of goods, to be sold for her, and that the defendant had received for the same a sum of money, and that the defendant had refused to pay to her the proceeds of the sale of the goods, and that the plaintiff had demanded payment to her of the amount due on said book, which defendant had declined to pay. The court held that as the book was issued in the name of Mary Kavanagh, and not to the plaintiff, Bridget; hence that the plaintiff could not recover in this action, and granted a verdict for the defendant, to which the plaintiff excepted.

The court decided to direct a verdict as requested by the defendant, and submitted the question to the jury after the opening argument for the plaintiff, the defendant's counsel declining to reply. Verdict for plaintiff to recover \$500.

Erin Waterman, Martin & Hitt for plaintiff, Butler for the defendant.

Mary Ritter Sherrill vs. Strook & L. Smith. This was an action of general assumpsit. The plaintiff claimed, and her evidence tended to show, that in October, 1894, she delivered to the defendant, Strook & L. Smith, a certain quantity of goods, to be sold for her, and that the defendant had received for the same a sum of money, and that the defendant had refused to pay to her the proceeds of the sale of the goods, and that the plaintiff had demanded payment to her of the amount due on said book, which defendant had declined to pay. The court held that as the book was issued in the name of Mary Kavanagh, and not to the plaintiff, Bridget; hence that the plaintiff could not recover in this action, and granted a verdict for the defendant, to which the plaintiff excepted.

The court decided to direct a verdict as requested by the defendant, and submitted the question to the jury after the opening argument for the plaintiff, the defendant's counsel declining to reply. Verdict for plaintiff to recover \$500.

Erin Waterman, Martin & Hitt for plaintiff, Butler for the defendant.

The Miller-Crosby Combination of Brattleboro Down Local Team 12 to 3.

The most notable ball game that Brattleboro has ever seen was played there Saturday between the local team and the so-called Miller-Crosby combination of Brattleboro. The Brattleboro team was assisted by players from Jamaica, Rawsonville, Manchester and South Londonderry, the nine being a strong one. The visitors, however, had an easy victory, their free hitting and Cox's effective twirling being the important factors in the result. The Brattleboro team scored in the seventh, when Robins was given first on balls, went to second on a wild pitch, and came home on Waite's fumble of a foul ball which Umpire Dunklee finally called fair in response to the demands of the crowd. Williams crossed the plate in the seventh when Robins scored on a base on balls, stole second and scored on Crosby's miff of Pie's fly. The Miller-Crosby combination earned five runs, three in the second on two baggers by Cox and Bean and singles by Crosby and Johnson, and two in the ninth on Johnson's two bagger, Waite's single and Perry's two bagger. The other scores were on combinations of hits and errors.

The Miller-Crosby team played a fine fielding game considering the rocky ground. Cox not only pitched well but he fielded his position in A. I. style. Ware backed him up in good form, catching his best game this season. Roberts and Perry also did yeoman's service and Waite played well in spite of two errors.

For the Brattleboro team, the circus catch of a drive off Bean's bat and Wardwell's all around work were noticeable. Johnson led at the bat, but Cox was close behind with two long two baggers and a single. Bean and Perry also made long drives, and every man in the team is credited with a hit. The Brattleboro team only four fair balls outside the diamond.

The Miller-Crosby team are enthusiastic over the hospitable manner in which they were entertained by Manager Stockwell of the Morgan House.

The score tells the story in detail:

Miller-Crosby team.

Brattleboro team.

Miller-Crosby team.

Brattleboro team.

Miller-Crosby team.

Brattleboro team.